

REMARKS

This paper is in response to the Final Office Action mailed December 21, 2007. In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1, 4, 5, 8-11, 13, 16, 17, 20-23, 25, 28-29, 32-35, and 44-52 under 35 U.S.C. § 103. The Examiner further objected to claim 45. In this response, claims 44 and 45 have been amended. No claims have been cancelled or added. Reconsideration in light of the remarks made herein is respectfully requested.

Claim Objection

The Examiner Objected to claim 45 as containing informalities. Applicants have accordingly amended claim 45 to correct the noted typographical errors. Furthermore, Applicants note that claim 45 has been amended to depend from claim 8, and not claim 44 as assumed in the Office Action. In light of the amendments, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the objections.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

The Examiner rejects claims 1, 4, 5, 8-11, 13, 16, 17, 20-23, 25, 28-29, 32-35, and 44-52 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Morris, et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,420,974) in view of Schena, et al., (U.S. Patent No. 6,448,979). Applicants respectfully disagree.

Morris describes a document that is divided into two types of fields. A first field type of the document displays text and images, and a second field type of the document displays check boxes (Morris, column 1, line 58 to column 2, line 9). When a check box field is checked, non-visual content (audio, video, or animation not displayed in the document) for the document is available. During creation of a document, if a checked box for a second field type is selected by a user, a dialog box prompts the user to specify an address for the audio or video content (Morris,

column 2, line 61 to column 3, line 4). A pointer is created for the content so that when a user selects a checked box in a document, the content may be accessed from storage via the pointer (Morris, column 3, lines 4-27).

Schena describes a system in which a bar code is read from a printed medium (Schena, column 1, line 61 to column 2, line 25). The bar code contains link information to corresponding multimedia sequence information, such as advertising, transaction information, text information, etc. (Schena, column 2, lines 13-25; column 3, line 58 to column 4, line 5). A scanner that detects the barcode routes the link information to a server, which selects information corresponding to the received link (Schena, column 2, lines 29-54).

Claim 1 recites:

A method comprising:
creating a multimedia annotation for a paper document, the multimedia annotation representing at least one of an audio sound and a video clip; and
creating a first multimedia document by combining the paper document and the multimedia annotation represented by a first bar code encoding the at least one of the audio sound and video clip,
wherein the first multimedia document is generated as a part of reproducing the paper document via a document reproduction system, wherein the multimedia annotation is captured via an input device of the document reproduction system while the paper document is being reproduced via the document reproduction system, wherein the captured multimedia annotation is encoded within the first bar code, and
wherein the first multimedia document, which when scanned by a process, the process causes the printed multimedia annotation to be decoded, the at least one of the audio sound and video clip to be extracted from the multimedia annotation, and the at least one extracted audio sound and video clip can be played via a multimedia player.

That is, claim 1 includes encoding at least one of an audio and video clip, captured via an input device of a document reproduction system, in a bar code. The bar code can be printed on a multimedia document, when the multimedia document is generated by the document reproduction system, such as a scanner or copier. The multimedia document includes the bar

code encoding the audio sound and/or video clip which can be subsequently scanned and decoded to extract the audio sound and/or video clip from the barcode. The audio and/or video clips extracted and decoded from the barcode can then be played by a multimedia player.

Applicants respectfully submit that neither Morris nor Schena, alone or in combination, describe or suggest a multimedia document with a barcode encoding audio and/or video clips such that the audio and/or video clips may be subsequently extracted and played from the barcode.

The Examiner states that Morris fails to describe a multimedia annotation as a barcode, and that a captured multimedia annotation is encoded within a first barcode (Office Action, mailed December 21, 2007, page 7). Instead, Morris describes that audio, video, or animation associated with a document is stored in a storage directory for the document, and a pointer in the document points to the storage location. Thus, Morris must fail to describe or suggest a multimedia document with a barcode encoding audio and/or video clips such that the audio and/or video clips may be subsequently extracted and played from the barcode.

Schena is utilized by the Examiner to make up for the deficiencies of Morris (Office Action, page 7 *citing* Schena, column 3, lines 60-65; column 1, lines 10-25). However, Schena describes that bar codes may contain link information to a provider of multimedia content, such a provider of advertising, transaction information, text information, etc. (Schena, column 1, lines 10-25; column 2, lines 13-25; column 3, line 58 to column 4, line 5). Furthermore, the type of barcode used to encode the provider link information may be of differing types (Schena, column 60-65). The link described by Schena, whether it is a standard, enhanced, or high density barcode, only provides a pointer to a location where the encoded annotation may be obtained.

The link, itself, however is not described by Schena as being encoded such that it can be played as a voice or video clip in a media player.

The Examiner further states:

Schena discloses the machine-readable code on the paper is used to communicate corresponding multimedia information when the machine-readable code is read by a scanner. The URL encoded in the machine-readable code on the printed medium annotates the printed medium with the referenced multimedia file, thus combining the printed medium with virtual multimedia.

(Office Action, mailed 12/27/2007, page 24 [emphasis added])

Applicants respectfully point out, that by the Examiner's own words Schena provides for a printed medium that is connected to virtual media via a URL link specifying where the virtual media is stored and may be accessed. Thus, a scanner that reads a machine-readable code, may obtain the URL link, traverse the link, and access the virtual multimedia which is stored apart from the printed medium. There is no hint or suggest that the machine-readable code in Schena encodes multimedia data, such as voice and sound clips, in a barcode.

Therefore, because Morris and Schena describe encoding static links and pointers in a document that may be traversed or accessed to obtain content indicated by the link or pointer, neither Morris nor Schena, alone or in combination, provide for encoding multimedia data, such as voice and sound clips, in a barcode as claimed by the Applicants.

Furthermore, the Examiner previously stated that Schena fails to teach or suggest:

wherein the multimedia annotation is captured via an input device of the document reproduction system while the paper document is being reproduced via the document reproduction system, wherein the captured multimedia annotation is encoded within the first bar code.

(See Final Office Action, mailed August 9, 2007, page 9)

The Examiner utilizes Morris to supply the limitation. In the passage of Morris, cited by the Examiner, Morris recites:

If the operator designates a box as a visual field box, a directory definition begins in which the object type is defined, the object sub-type is defined, and the image coordinates are defined.

If the box being defined is a check box, then the sub-type is defined as either audio, video, image, text, or other type object. The resulting directory and the image object of the overall scanned-in form, are stored in a mixed object document content architecture envelope (MODCA).

Later, when a filled-out hard copy of the form is desired to be entered into the image archiving system, the filled-out copy of the master form is scanned-in to the system. A special indicium is associated with each master form, which uniquely identifies that form and distinguishes it from all other master forms created for the system. The system reads the indicium from the scanned-in form and then accesses the MODCA envelope the directory for the master form is then accessed to obtain the coordinates of each component field on the scanned-in form.

(Morris, column 2, lines 17-38)

In the passage, Morris describes creating a document directory for storing audio, video, image, text, etc. which are defined as being part of a document. However, Morris further states that in order to add content, such as audio or video, to a document, “If the box which contains a mark in it is a check box, then the directory for the master form is accessed to determine the object type. A dialog box is presented to the operator in which the operator is requested to enter the media address for the object” (Morris, column 2, lines 61-65). Thus, Morris adds multimedia content to a document by receiving an address for a content object, and then storing the content in a directory associated with the document. Morris, however, fails to describe or suggest that a “multimedia annotation is captured via an input device of the document reproduction system while the paper document is being reproduced via the document reproduction system” because Morris merely receives an address where content is stored, but does not capture the content via

an input device of the document reproduction system. Therefore, Schena and Morris also fail to describe or suggest “wherein the multimedia annotation is captured via an input device of the document reproduction system while the paper document is being reproduced via the document reproduction system, wherein the captured multimedia annotation is encoded within the first bar code.”

Therefore, Morris and Schena, alone or in combination, fail to render claim 1 obvious for at least the reasons set forth above. Because claims 13 and 25 include limitations similar to those discussed above with respect to claim 1, claims 13 and 25 are similarly not anticipated by Morris and Schena. Given the remaining claims depend from one of the above independent claims, for reasons similar to those set forth above, it is respectfully submitted that the rest of the claims are also patentable over Morris and Schena.

In view of the above, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of claims 1, 4, 5, 8-11, 13, 16, 17, 20-23, 25, 28-29, 32-35, and 44-52 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Morris in view of Schena.

Conclusion

Applicants respectfully submit that all claims are in condition for allowance, and such action is earnestly solicited. Applicants reserve all rights with respect to the applicability of the doctrine of equivalents. If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite or assist in the allowance of the present application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney at (408) 720-8300. Applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

Respectfully submitted,
BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Dated: March 21, 2008

By /Michael J. Mallie/
Michael J. Mallie
Attorney for Applicant
Reg. No. 36,591

1279 Oakmead Parkway
Sunnyvale, California 94085
(408) 720-8300